

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of April 19, 2005.

Status of the Application

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-32, 34-37, and 39-50 were pending. Claims 1, 10, 19-31, 36, 37, and 39-41 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, 12-32, 34-37, and 39-50 remain pending.

In view of above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1, 3-10, 12-32, 34-37, and 39-50 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,606,527 to de Andrade, Jr. et al. (de Andrade) in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,496 to Irwin et al. (Irwin); U.S. Patent No. 6,292,708 to Allen et al. (Allen); U.S. Patent No. 6,488,037 to Guldi (Guldi); U.S. Patent No. 6,000,830 to Asano et al. (Asano); U.S. Patent No. 6,438,436 to Hohkibara et al. (Hohkibara); and U.S. Patent No. 5,113,350 to Sargent (Sargent). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Each of the pending independent claims is amended to more specifically clarify that the batch process campaign is created by a campaign manager using information retrieved from a database of a batch executive, the batch executive being configured to send instructions to a process controller to direct a set of field devices to carry out process steps associated with batches being executed by the batch executive. Batch information in the database of the batch executive includes information used by the batch executive to cause batches to be executed. For example, batch information may include recipe information, equipment availability and profiles, binding information, batch execution status information, etc. As explained in the present application, conventional campaign creation techniques did not utilize information within the database of a batch executive. Rather, batch information needed to create a batch campaign was kept in a separate database. Thus, if a change was

made to information in one of the databases, a user would need to manually update any other databases having that information. As a result, a significant effort was required to duplicate the batch information database of the batch executive and to keep the multiple batch information databases synchronized.

Claims 19 and 31 are amended to recite “sending a first message requesting batch information to a batch executive, the batch executive configured to send instructions to a process controller for directing a set of field devices to carry out process steps associated with a batch being executed by the batch executive, the batch executive having a database containing batch information,” “receiving from the batch executive a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting batch information, the set of batch information retrieved from the database of the batch executive,” and “creating the batch process campaign using at least a portion of the set of batch information retrieved from the database of the batch executive.” Claims 25 and 36 are similarly amended.

Claim 1 now recites “sending a first message requesting batch information to the batch executive, the batch executive configured to send instructions to a process controller for directing a set of field devices to carry out process steps associated with a batch being executed by the batch executive, the batch executive having a database containing batch information,” “receiving from the batch executive a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting batch information, the set of batch information including recipe information, the set of batch information retrieved from the database of the batch executive,” “prompting a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of the set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one batch from the plurality of batches,” and “using the first and second inputs to create the batch process campaign.” Claim 10 is similarly amended. Also, claim 41 now recites “the campaign manager configured to create a batch process campaign using batch-related information from the batch information database of the batch executive.”

None of the cited art discloses or suggests a batch executive configured to send instructions to a process controller for directing a set of field devices to carry out process steps associated with a batch being executed by the batch executive, the batch executive having a database containing batch information, and creating a batch campaign using batch

information from the database of the batch executive as essentially recited by each of the pending claims.

de Andrade does not disclose or suggest a batch executive as recited in the claims. Rather, de Andrade merely describes a scheduling system that analyzes a number of variables, such as orders, raw materials, etc. to generate a set of production plans used to define a preferred operation of a manufacturing plant. These production plans or schedules are not used by a batch executive routine, a process controller or any other control device to actually cause a batch run to be implemented within a process plant. To the contrary, the schedules or production plans of the de Andrade system are simply visual, human readable plans that define, for a human such as a plant operator, the best or most efficient schedule to be used to produce the products contained within a set of received orders, to maximize the efficiency of the plant as defined by one or more objective functions, etc. The user or operator of the de Andrade system must still take manual steps to cause these plans to actually be implemented within the process plant (in this case a steel production plant). See for example, column 13, lines 8-13 of de Andrade which clearly indicates that human resources are allocated to carry out the steps defined in the schedule or plan created in the stand alone computer of Figs. 3 and 4.

As de Andrade does not disclose or suggest a batch executive as recited in the claims, de Andrade also does not disclose or suggest a database of a batch executive or creating a batch campaign using batch information from the database of the batch executive as essentially recited by each of the pending claims.

Irwin describes a process control system having a controller that communicates with field devices to perform one or more process control routines. Irwin describes a batch executive implemented on the controller or a workstation coupled to the controller that may be used to implement batch processes. See Irwin at col. 5, lines 42-67. But Irwin does not disclose or suggest creating a batch campaign using batch information from a database of the batch executive.

Similarly, each of Allen, Guldi, Asano, Hohkibara and Sargent fails to provide a disclosure of, a suggestion of, or any motivation for a batch executive and creating a batch process campaign using information from a database of the batch executive as recited in the

pending claims. Because each of de Andrade, Irwin, Allen, Guldi, Asano, Hohkibara and Sargent fails to disclose or suggest creating a batch campaign using batch information from a database of a batch executive, it follows that no combination of these documents can render any of the pending claims obvious.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above application is in condition for allowance. If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Dated: July 21, 2005



Respectfully submitted,

By

Gregory E. Stanton

Registration No.: 45,127

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants